

### **Remarks**

The inventor appreciates the examiner's tenacity in pointing out the application's failings in clarity of the teaching, and organization within the claims and in particular claim 1.

#### **Phone Interview Response –Claim 1 –Rotational Interpretation**

The examiner has pointed out in the recent phone interview that a possibility exists for the force arrows of Fig. 1 to be interpreted as rotational arrows. The response to this possible interpretation is (1) these force arrows 7 are shown in the plane of the axis of the stiffener in Fig. 1 since no tank structure is shown, (2) these force arrows 7 are described as moments (a force times a lever arm, not a rotation turning) and (3) these force arrows 7 are shown in Fig. 1 acting on the tank stiffener alone as a free body since no supporting structure is illustrated. Further (4) it will be recognized that a slip joint as shown has no utility to resist rotation.


#### **Claim 1 Amendment Discussion**

The inventor appreciates the examiner's objection to the clarity of claim 1 and offers the addition of the phrase to clarify the exact restraint.

moment restraint by congruent wall slip joint surfaces against external forces that would distort the shape of the tank,

The inventor also appreciates the examiner's objection to the organization of claim 1 and therefore reorganizes the claim for clarity.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Bettinger, Inventor Pro Se  
734 675-8295  
Fax 734 675-8296  
[techpart@comcast.net](mailto:techpart@comcast.net)